



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

CONTRACTS—TRADE UNIONS—CONTRACTS WITH EMPLOYERS.—*KISSAM v. UNITED STATES PRINTING CO. OF OHIO*, 92 N. E., 214 (N. Y.).—*Held*, a contract between an employer and trades unions, prohibiting the employment of non-union workmen, is not invalid as to such workmen, where it results in great benefit to the employer, disposes of differences between him and the labor unions, is not entered into with malice against the non-union workmen, nor with intent to injure them, and where it is not sought to compel them to join the union.

Agreements which are contrary to public policy are void. *McNamara v. Gargett*, 68 Mich., 454; *Cothran v. Ellis*, 125 Ill., 496. But a contract to trade exclusively with a particular party is not void. *Long v. Towl*, 42 Mo., 545; *Ward v. Hogan*, 11 Abb. N. Cases (N. Y.), 478. And it is not illegal for workmen to form an association to protect themselves against the encroachments of their employers. *Snow v. Wheeler*, 113 Mass., 179; *Gray v. Building Trades Council*, 91 Minn., 171. However, an agreement between a labor association and an employers' association, that all employees of the members of the employers' association shall be members of the labor association, is illegal. *Curran v. Galen*, 152 N. Y., 33. The question involved in the principal case seems to have been considered but once before, both decisions being in accord. *Jacobs v. Cohen*, 183 N. Y., 207. But in contracts for public work, stipulations that none but union labor shall be employed, are invalid. *Atlanta v. Stein*, 111 Ga., 789; *Adams v. Brennan*, 177 Ill., 194; *State ex rel. Robert Mitchell Furniture Co. v. Toole*, 26 Mont., 22.

COURTS—JURISDICTIONAL AMOUNT.—*BEATY v. GOGGAN & BRO.*, 131 S. W., 631 (TEX.).—*Held*, that a court has jurisdiction of an action for recovery of a debt and foreclosure of the lien thereof on personal property, the value of the property not exceeding its jurisdiction, though the amount of the debt does.

The amount demanded in the complaint is, in general, the criterion of jurisdiction. *Pharis v. Carver*, 52 Ky., 236; *Burr v. Bayne*, 10 Watts (Pa.), 299. But a modification of this rule is made in a suit in chancery, where, to protect land from a claim assessed against it, the value of the land, and not the amount of the claim, determines the jurisdiction of the court. *Matteson v. Matteson*, 132 Mich., 516; *Speyer v. Miller*, 108 La., 204. Again, where a court renders a judgment within its jurisdiction, the fact that the complaint prayed a recovery in excess of the jurisdiction will not affect the validity of the judgment. *Wratten v. Wilson*, 22 Cal., 466; *In re Barbour*, 52 How. Prac. (N. Y.), 94. And jurisdiction is not lost where a portion of the claim is disallowed, thus bringing the amount below the jurisdiction of the court. *Hardin v. Cass County*, 42 Fed., 652. As to whether the market or face value of a security is the test of jurisdiction, there is a conflict. Some courts hold that they cannot judicially know that the market value is different from the value on the face of the instrument. *Gentry v. Gilkey*, 24 Ky., 372. On the other hand, some courts hold that the market and not the face value of the subject of the con-